

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/501,110	12/02/2004	Shiroo Muraoka	61625 (70232)	1701
	7590 07/19/2007 NGELL PALMER & DOD	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 5587	74	VENCI, DAVID J		
BOSTON, MA 02205			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	·		1641	
		•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/19/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

 i 		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/501,110	MURAOKA ET AL.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		David J. Venci	1641		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	pears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address		
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Densions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period tree to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing department term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 136(a). In no event, however, may a re will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT e. cause the application to become ABA	CATION. APPly be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>Sep</u>	tember 13, 2006.	•		
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
3)	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
	closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposit	ion of Claims				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	awn from consideration.			
Applicat	ion Papers				
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on <u>July 8, 2004</u> is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	☑ accepted or b)☐ objected if the drawing(s)	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documen 2. Certified copies of the priority documen 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documen application from the International Burea See the attached detailed Office action for a list	its have been received. Its have been received in Apprity documents have been a au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage		
Attachmen	at(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	A) [] Internition (2)			
2) Notice 3) Infor	ce of References Cited (P10-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date 09/16/04; 08/14/06; 09/13/06.	Paper No(s)	ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date formal Patent Application 		

Application/Control Number: 10/501,110

Art Unit: 1641

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Specification

The abstract is objected to because the abstract does not disclose that which is new in the art to which

the invention pertains. Since this patent application is in the nature of an improvement to old processes

or compositions, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In addition, the

abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to

particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, step (2), the phrase "immunogen denatured previously" lacks antecedent basis.

In claim 1, step (2), the phrase "the ionic surfactant used in step (1)" lacks antecedent basis.

In claim 1, step (2)(a), the phrase "the solution" lacks antecedent basis.

Application/Control Number: 10/501,110

Art Unit: 1641

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Page 3

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the

rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or

on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 4-7 and 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Knowles & Marchesi

(4,658,022).

Knowles & Marchesi describe immunoassays (see Abstract, last sentence) comprising:

(1) extracting/solubilizing a protein with an ionic surfactants (see e.g., col. 8, line 15, "sodium

dodecylsulfate";

(2) adding an antibody obtained by using the protein as immunogen (see col. 9, lines 56-60) to:

(a) the protein solution obtained in (1) without substantially diluting the solution (see lines

36-38, "A sufficient amount of the denatured protein must remain in solution or

suspension in order to obtain useful immunobinding"; see also, sentence bridging

cols. 8-9, "For guanidine[...] less than about 1.0 molar, with about 0.3 molar being

particularly preferred") (paraphrasing mine).

(3) detecting the antigen-antibody complex (see col. 10, lines 20-25).

With respect to claims 11, 12 and 17, Knowles & Marchesi describe assays for proteins found in

buckwheat, wheat and peanuts (see col. 9, lines 16-20).

Art Unit: 1641

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 3 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Knowles & Marchesi (4,658,022) in view of Powell, Current Protocols in Molecular Biology, Unit 17.14A, John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (1995).

Knowles & Marchesi describe immunoassays as substantially described supra.

Knowles & Marchesi do not specify particular sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS) concentrations and 2-mercaptoethanol concentration in the "aqueous solvent" (i.e., claims 2, 3 and 8). Knowles & Marchesi do not teach a boiling step (i.e., claims 9 and 10).

However, Powell describes methods for preparing glycoproteins for characterization (see p. 17.14.1, first and second sentences), including fine procedural details. Specifically, Powell describes an "aqueous solvent" having at least 0.3% SDS and 1M 2-mercaptoethanol (see *Basic Protocol*, p. 17.14.2, *Materials*, "20% (w/v) sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS)"; "1 M 2-mercaptoethanol (2-ME)"). In addition, Powell describes a boiling step lasting at least 5 minutes (see *Basic Protocol*, p. 17.14.3, *Digest with protease*, Step 7, "Boil 10 min").

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill to optimize Knowles' & Marchesi's method using Powell's particular sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS) concentrations, 2-mercaptoethanol concentration, and

Application/Control Number: 10/501,110

Art Unit: 1641

boiling step because Powell's steps remove "low-molecular-weight glycopeptides, degradation products,

Page 5

and sugar precursors", which Powell says is necessary prior to glycopeptide analysis (see Critical

Parameters and Troubleshooting, p. 17.14.8., left column, item 1).

Conclusion

No claims are allowable at this time.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to David J. Venci whose telephone number

is 571-272-2879. The examiner can normally be reached on 08:00 - 16:30 (EST). If attempts to reach

the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on 571-

272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is

571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from

either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC)

at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative

or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-

1000.

LONG V. LE 07/09/07

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

David J Venci Assistant Examiner Art Unit 1641

djv